SJS 44 (Rev. 12/07, NJ 5/08)

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)

the civil docket sheet. (SEE II	NSTRUCTIONS ON THE REVERSE OF THE FORM.)				
I. (a) PLAINTIFFS		DEFENDANTS			
RUCHE MARINO		NCO FINANCIA	NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC.		
(b) County of Residence	of First Listed Plaintiff	County of Residence o	f First Listed Defendant		
(c) Attorney's (Firm Na	me, Address, Telephone Number and Email Addr	NOTE: IN LAND	O CONDEMNATION CASES, US	E THE LOCATION OF THE	
Craig Thor Kimmel, E Kimmel & Silverman, 30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 (215) 540-8888		Attorneys (If Known)	NVOLVED.		
II. BASIS OF JURISI	OICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	III. CITIZENSHIP OF P	RINCIPAL PARTIES(Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff	
☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff	■ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)	(For Diversity Cases Only) PT Citizen of This State			
2 U.S. Government Defendant	☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)	Citizen of Another State	2		
	(musing characters)	Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country	3		
	T (Place an "X" in One Box Only)	TODERHUM TOMES AT THE	DANIZDYIDDGV	(ATHID) CHATTERING	
CONTRACT 110 Insurance 120 Marine 130 Miller Act 140 Negotiable Instrument 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment 151 Medicare Act 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excl. Veterans) 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits 160 Stockholders' Suits 190 Other Contract 195 Contract Product Liability 196 Franchise REAL PROPERTY 210 Land Condemnation 220 Foreclosure 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment 240 Torts to Land 245 Tort Product Liability 290 All Other Real Property	Slander 330 Federal Employers' Liability 340 Marine 345 Marine Product Liability 350 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability 385 Property Damage	620 Other Food & Drug 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 630 Liquor Laws 640 R.R. & Truck 650 Airline Regs. 660 Occupational Safety/Health 690 Other 710 Fair Labor Standards Act 720 Labor/Mgmt. Relations 730 Labor/Mgmt. Reporting & Disclosure Act 740 Railway Labor Act 790 Other Labor Litigation 791 Empl. Ret. Inc. Security Act IMMIGRATION	BANKRUPTCY □ 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 □ 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS □ 820 Copyrights □ 840 Trademark SOCIAL SECURITY □ 861 HIA (1395ff) □ 862 Black Lung (923) □ 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) □ 864 SSID Title XVI □ 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS □ 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) □ 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609	OTHER STATUTES □ 400 State Reapportionment □ 410 Antitrust □ 430 Banks and Banking □ 450 Commerce □ 460 Deportation □ 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations ■ 480 Consumer Credit □ 490 Cable/Sat TV □ 810 Selective Service □ 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange □ 875 Customer Challenge □ 12 USC 3410 □ 890 Other Statutory Actions □ 891 Agricultural Acts □ 892 Economic Stabilization Act □ 893 Environmental Matters □ 894 Energy Allocation Act □ 895 Freedom of Information Act □ 900Appeal of Fee Determination Under Equal Access to Instice □ 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes	
⊠1 Original □ 2 Re	ate Court Appellate Court	Reopened anothe	Terred from	Appeal to District ct 🗍 7 Judge from Magistrate Judgment	
VI. CAUSE OF ACTI	Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you ar	e filing (Do not cite jurisdictiona	al statutes unless diversity):	<u> </u>	
VII CHOOL OF HOLE	Brief description of cause: Fair Debt Collection Practices Ac	et			
VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:	☐ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER F.R.C.P. 23	DEMAND \$	CHECK YES only JURY DEMAND:	f demanded in complaint:	
VIII. RELATED CASE(S) (See instructions): JUDGE DOCKET NUMBER					
Explanation:					
DATE	SIGNATURE	FATTORNEY OF RECORD			
11-14-11					

Case 2:11-cv-07091-CMR Document 1 Filed 11/14/11 Page 2 of 10 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA — DESIGNATION FORM assignment to appropriate calendar.	to be used by counsel to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of
Address of Plaintiff: 556 Fiacomo Street, Norco,	LA 70079
Address of Defendant: 507 Prodential Road, Horsh	0.0
Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction:	
(Use Reverse Side Fo	or Additional Space)
Does this civil action involve a nongovernmental corporate party with any parent corporation (Attach two copies of the Disclosure Statement Form in accordance with Fed.R.Civ.P. 7.1	
Does this case involve multidistrict litigation possibilities?	Yes□ No □
RELATED CASE, IF ANY:	Date Tempinated
Case Number:Judge	Date Terminated:
Civil cases are deemed related when yes is answered to any of the following questions:	
1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within on	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a pri	Yes□ No ☐ Ves□
action in this court?	
3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earli	Yes No No
terminated action in this court?	Yes No
4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil ri	
	Yes□ No□
CIVIL: (Place ✓ in ONE CATEGORY ONLY)	
 A. Federal Question Cases: 1. □ Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts 	B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:1. □ Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
2. □ FELA	 □ Airplane Personal Injury
3. □ Jones Act-Personal Injury	3. □ Assault, Defamation
4. □ Antitrust	4. □ Marine Personal Injury
5. □ Patent	5. □ Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
	<i>y y</i>
6. □ Labor-Management Relations	6. □ Other Personal Injury (Please specify)
7 El Civil Diches	7. Products Liability
7. Civil Rights	·
8. Habeas Corpus	8. Products Liability — Asbestos O. All other Diversity Coass
9. ☐ Securities Act(s) Cases	9. □ All other Diversity Cases
10. ☐ Social Security Review Cases	(Please specify)
11. All other Federal Question Cases 15 V.S.C. \$ 1692 (Please specify)	
ARBITRATION CER	RTIFICATION
I, Craig Thor Kimme , counsel of record do hereby co	c Category)
Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, Section 3(c)(2), that to the best of my knowledge a	and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of
\$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs;	
□ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.	
DATE: 11-14-11	57100
Attorney-a Law NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if	Attorney I.D.# there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.
Loortify that to my knowledge the within ease is not related to any ease new new line	or within any year proviously terminated action in this court
I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case is not related to any case now pending except as noted above.	or within one year previously terminated action in this court
DATE: 11-14-11	57100
DATE:	Attorney I.D.#

CIV. 609 (6/08)

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

CIVIL ACTION

V.	:					
NCO Financial	Systems, Inc.	NO.				
n accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for claintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of claim the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse ide of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track of which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.						
SELECT ONE OF THE FO	DLLOWING CASE MANAGEM	IENT TRACKS:				
a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255.						
(b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits.						
c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2.						
(d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos.						
e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court. (See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.)						
(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks.						
-14- Date 215-540-8888	Craig Thor Kimmel Attorney-at-law 877-778-2864		·Com			
Γelephone	FAX Number	E-Mail Address				

(Civ. 660) 10/02

Ruche Marino

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE 2 EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA 3 RUCHE MARINO, 4 Plaintiff 5 Case No.: v. 6 7 NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC., **COMPLAINT AND DEMAND FOR** JURY TRIAL 8 Defendant (Unlawful Debt Collection Practices) 9 10 **COMPLAINT** 11 RUCHE MARINO ("Plaintiff"), by and through his attorneys, KIMMEL & 12 SILVERMAN, P.C., alleges the following against NCO FINANCIAL SYSTEMS, INC. 13 ("Defendant"): 14 INTRODUCTION 15 Plaintiff's Complaint is based on the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 1. 16 U.S.C. § 1692 et seq. ("FDCPA"). 17 JURISDICTION AND VENUE 18 Jurisdiction of this court arises pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(d), which states 2. 19 that such actions may be brought and heard before "any appropriate United States district court 20 21 without regard to the amount in controversy," and 28 U.S.C. § 1331 grants this court original 22 jurisdiction of all civil actions arising under the laws of the United States. 23 Defendant has its corporate headquarters in the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania 3. 24 and as such, personal jurisdiction is established. 25 4. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(1).

3

45

6

7

9

10 11

12

14

13

15

16

17

18

19 20

21

2223

24

25

PARTIES

- 5. Plaintiff is a natural person residing in Norco, Louisiana.
- 6. Plaintiff is a "consumer" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. §1692a(3).
- 7. Defendant is a national debt collection company with its corporate headquarters located at 507 Prudential Road, Horsham, PA 19044.
- 8. Defendant is a "debt collector" as that term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6), and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 9. Defendant acted through its agents, employees, officers, members, directors, heirs, successors, assigns, principals, trustees, sureties, subrogees, representatives, and insurers.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

- 10. At all pertinent times hereto, Defendant was hired to collect a consumer debt for Citibank and attempted to collect that debt from Plaintiff.
- 11. The debt arose out of transactions that were primarily for personal, family, or household purposes.
- 12. Beginning on or about July 1, 2011, and continuing through October 2011, Defendant continuously and repeatedly contacted Plaintiff on his cellular and work telephones in an attempt to collect an alleged debt.
- 13. Defendant contacted Plaintiff, on average, two (2) times a day, causing Plaintiff to receive between ten (10) to twenty (20) collection calls a month.
- 14. Most recently, Defendant contacted Plaintiff on October 6, 2011, in an attempt to collect a debt.
- 15. Additionally, Plaintiff is employed by the St. Charles, Louisiana Sheriff's Office as a Deputy Sheriff.

- 16. Plaintiff is not permitted to receive personal calls at work.
- 17. In early July 2011, during a conversation with Defendant, Plaintiff informed Defendant that he was not permitted to receive phone calls at work and instructed Defendant not to contact him at work.
- 18. Despite Plaintiff's instructions to Defendant not to contact him at work, Defendant continued to contact Plaintiff at his place of employment.
- 19. To further harass Plaintiff, in July 2011, Defendant left a voicemail message on Plaintiff's cellular telephone threatening to call him at work if he did not return Defendant's call.
- 20. Defendant made telephone calls to Plaintiff's place of employment and left voicemail messages threatening to call his place of employment, with the intent to cause stress, fear and humiliation to Plaintiff, believing that to do so would substantially increase the likelihood of the debt being paid by Plaintiff.
- 21. Based on the frequency of Defendant's calls, Plaintiff felt that the only way he could stop the calls was to hang up on Defendant when it called.
- 22. As a result Defendant threatened Plaintiff that it would "keep calling [his] fucking phone 'til [he] answer[ed]."
- 23. Plaintiff became so upset and angered by the language used by Defendant's collector and felt so harassed and abused, that he admittedly reacted on one occasion by using profanity himself, thinking that was the only means by which he would be heard.
- 24. Then, in or around September 2011, Defendant contacted Plaintiff and threatened to bring a lawsuit against Plaintiff if he did not pay the alleged debt.
 - 25. Upon information and belief, at the time Defendant to take legal action against

Plaintiff, Defendant did not intend to commence legal action against Plaintiff and had not intended to consult with an attorney.

- 26. The language and threats used by Defendant were intentional efforts to increase Plaintiff's level of stress and anxiety, in hopes of obtaining payment from Plaintiff by any means necessary, whether Plaintiff was harmed or not.
- 27. Upon information and belief, Defendant rarely, if ever, takes legal action against individuals.
- 28. The repetitive calls to Plaintiff were intended by Defendant to be disturbing, harassing, and an invasion of privacy, so that Plaintiff would pay the alleged debt.

CONSTRUCTION OF APPLICABLE LAW

- Durand, 103 F.3d 1232 (5th Cir. 1997). "Because the Act imposes strict liability, a consumer need not show intentional conduct by the debt collector to be entitled to damages." Russell v. Equifax A.R.S., 74 F. 3d 30 (2d Cir. 1996); see also Gearing v. Check Brokerage Corp., 233 F.3d 469 (7th Cir. 2000) (holding unintentional misrepresentation of debt collector's legal status violated FDCPA); Clomon v. Jackson, 988 F. 2d 1314 (2d Cir. 1993).
- 30. The FDCPA is a remedial statute, and therefore must be construed liberally in favor of the debtor. Sprinkle v. SB&C Ltd., 472 F. Supp. 2d 1235 (W.D. Wash. 2006). The remedial nature of the FDCPA requires that courts interpret it liberally. Clark v. Capital Credit & Collection Services, Inc., 460 F. 3d 1162 (9th Cir. 2006). "Because the FDCPA, like the Truth in Lending Act (TILA) 15 U.S.C §1601 et seq., is a remedial statute, it should be construed liberally in favor of the consumer." Johnson v. Riddle, 305 F. 3d 1107 (10th Cir. 2002).

17

22

23

24

25

The FDCPA is to be interpreted in accordance with the "least sophisticated" 31. consumer standard. See Jeter v. Credit Bureau, Inc., 760 F.2d 1168 (11th Cir. 1985); Graziano v. Harrison, 950 F. 2d 107 (3rd Cir. 1991); Swanson v. Southern Oregon Credit Service, Inc., 869 F.2d 1222 (9th Cir. 1988). The FDCPA was not "made for the protection of experts, but for the public - that vast multitude which includes the ignorant, the unthinking, and the credulous, and the fact that a false statement may be obviously false to those who are trained and experienced does not change its character, nor take away its power to deceive others less experienced." Id. The least sophisticated consumer standard serves a dual purpose in that it ensures protection of all consumers, even naive and trusting, against deceptive collection practices, and protects collectors against liability for bizarre or idiosyncratic interpretations of collection notices. Clomon, 988 F. 2d at 1318.

COUNT I DEFENDANT VIOLATED THE FAIR DEBT COLLECTION PRACTICES ACT

- In its actions to collect a debt, Defendant violated the FDCPA in one or more of 32. the following ways:
 - Defendant violated the FDCPA generally;
 - b. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(1) of the FDCPA when it communicated with Plaintiff at a time or place that it knew or should have known was inconvenient;
 - c. Defendant violated §1692c(a)(3) of the FDCPA when it communicated with Plaintiff at his place of employment after it knew or had reason to know that Plaintiff was not permitted to receive such communications;
 - d. Defendant violated §1692d of the FDCPA when it harassed, oppressed or

abused Plaintiff in connection with the collection of a debt;

- e. Defendant violated §1692d(2) of the FDCPA when it used obscene or profane language in connection with its attempt to collect a debt;
- f. Defendant violated §1692d(5) of the FDCPA when it caused Plaintiff's phone to ring repeatedly or continuously with the intent to annoy, abuse, or harass Plaintiff;
- g. Defendant violated §1692e of the FDCPA when it used false, deceptive, or misleading representation or means in connection with its attempt to collect a debt;
- h. Defendant violated §1692e(5) of the FDCPA when it threatened to take action that it did not intend to take, or could not lawfully take;
- Defendant violated §1692e(10) of the FDCPA when it used false representations or deceptive means in connection with its attempt to collect a debt; and
- j. Defendant violated §1692f of the FDCPA when it used unfair and unconscionable means in connection with the collection of a debt.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff, RUCHE MARINO, respectfully prays for a judgment as follows:

- a. All actual damages suffered pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1);
- b. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for the violation of the FDCPA pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(2)(A);
- c. All reasonable attorneys' fees, witness fees, court costs and other litigation costs incurred by Plaintiff pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1693k(a)(3); and
- d. Any other relief deemed appropriate by this Honorable Court.

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that Plaintiff, RUCHE MARINO, demands a jury trial in this

case.

Date: 11-14-11

21

22

23

24

25

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED,

By: _

Craig Thor Kimmel Attorney ID No. 57100

Tara L. Patterson

Attorney ID No. 88343 Kimmel & Silverman, P.C.

30 E. Butler Pike Ambler, PA 19002 Phone: (215) 540-8888 Fax: (877) 788-2864

Email: Email: kimmel@creditlaw.com

tpatterson@creditlaw.com